

MAINE EMS EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, June 14, 2006
Member Present: D. Batsie (Chair Ed. Com.), J. Vaniotis (Chair Exam Com.) R. Petrie, K. Roderick, J. LeBrun, L. Delano, D. Russell, G. Utgard, B. Chamberlin, D. Kinney (MEMS), D. White (MEMS), J. Bradshaw (MEMS) R. Chase, D. Boucher

Absent: S. Diaz, , S. Latulippe, B. Zito, D. Palladino, M. Barter, D. Cornelio, B. Davis, D. Robishaw, S. Stewart-Dore, J. Wellman, T. Coleman

Timekeeper: D. Kinney
Scribe: D. Kinney

Meeting Opened at: 0930

- 1) Introductions
 - a) Introductions all around
- 2) Review of previous minutes waived due to joint meeting
- 3) Old Business
 - a) Batsie adjusted agenda to accommodate various avenues of feedback regarding IPE. Agenda will be guided by direction of the group.
 - b) White distributed reports on accumulated IPE evaluations. Pass rate approached 99.5%, most concerned documented were in regard to facilities and particular IPE circumstances.
 - i) Chamberlin voiced concern that post-test evaluations were not successful in capturing IPE flaws.
 - c) Batsie open discussion on "other concerns with the IPE"
 - i) Batsie stated a number of Region 4 instructors were concerned that the IPE is not successfully evaluating competency.
 - (1) Chamberlin noted incompetent students fumbling their way through test stations and still passing.
 - d) Delano and Boucher noted concern that IPE was truly not the "instructor's exam", but rather just a variation of a state exam.
 - e) LeBrun noted that some regions have two practical exams again. One course exam and one state.
 - i) Batsie confirmed that essentially that was how Region 4 was addressing IPE concerns.
 - ii) LeBrun noted that two exams comprise a "pre-screen" prior to the state exam and may affect the high pass rate.
 - iii) Petrie noted that the original intent of the process was to make the IPE the "instructor's test" but that due to EMS law, a separate test was mandatory.
 - iv) Bradshaw responded:

- (1) Law change may be possible.
 - (a) Opportunity could present itself next year (2007 legislative session)
 - (2) If law change was the goal, we would need to address short term issues as the process would be drawn out over at least a year.
 - (3) Suggested that Exam/Education give recommendation for law change if that was the consensus of both groups.
- 4) New Business
 - a) Batsie posed question: “where do we go from here?”
 - i) LeBrun noted concern over IC’s “signing off” on student competency.
 - (1) There would need to be a standard
 - (2) How could we then assure that all IC’s are upholding the standard
 - ii) Boucher discussed an accreditation process for all Maine EMS courses
 - (1) Batsie noted that Ed Com had been reviewing accreditation of programs to replace MEMS course approval process.
 - (2) LeBrun noted the IC would have to submit to the course sponsor what the final exam would be
 - (3) Perhaps a hybrid exam could be created with known standards IC’s must follow
 - iii) Petrie asked group to decide what our recommendation to the board would be
 - (1) Discussion followed
 - b) Group reached consensus on the following:
 - i) Continue the IPE in the short term
 - ii) Change law in the long term to allow flexibility and larger changes to the testing process.
 - c) Batsie asked what steps would be needed for change
 - i) Bradshaw asked if we need a law change
 - (1) Consensus of the group reached in the affirmative
 - (a) Delano, yes
 - (b) Russell, yes
 - (c) Chamberlin, yes
 - (d) Bradshaw, yes
 - (e) Vaniotis, yes (Still believes in the value of an outside test)
 - (f) Utgard, yes
 - (g) LeBrun, yes
 - (h) Chase, yes (Still believes in the value of an outside test)
 - (i) White, yes
 - (j) Kinney, yes
 - (k) Batsie, yes
 - (l) Petrie, yes
 - (m) Roderick, yes
 - (n) Boucher, yes
 - ii) White Clarification: Changing the law does not change the test. Rather, the law change would enable the board to change the test. How we would change the test is yet to be determined and work must begin immediately in that direction

- iii) White also noted that recommending the change does not guarantee change. The legislature could answer in the negative.
 - iv) Bradshaw noted we would need law language in the next 6 months
 - (1) **ACTION:** Bradshaw and White will work on legislative language and report back
- d) Batsie asked what happens in the short term?
 - i) Chamberlin requested we bring back “critical criteria” to the IPE
 - ii) Chamberlin noted further concern about not evaluating CPR or helmet removal.
 - iii) Delano asked if we could abandon IPE and return to State practical testing.
 - (1) Noted IPE’s have been an increased cost to the regions
 - iv) Boucher asked if we could “tweak” the existing exam to improve quality prior to the law change
 - (1) Much discussion ensued regarding the validity of the IPE
 - (2) Agreement reached that “tweaking” the IPE may be the only short term alternative.
 - (a) Group agreed that any change must be implemented by 8/15/06
- e) Batsie asked what changes we would propose to “tweak” IPE.
 - i) Group agreed that in the case of multiple IPE’s, combining would be ok.
 - (1) State evaluator fee would be \$250 per IPE
 - (a) Irregularly Large IPE’s would be discussed between sponsor and MEMS office.
 - ii) Group agreed that adding outside students to IPE would be ok.
 - iii) Ratio of PTA to student discussed.
 - (1) No consensus reached.
 - (2) Sponsor is responsible
 - (3) 1:1 is recommended ratio
 - iv) Adding critical criteria discussed
 - (1) Much discussion ensued.
 - (2) No consensus reached
 - (3) **ACTION:** Subcommittee formed
 - (a) **Batsie, Chase, Russell, Chamberlin, Utgard, Roderick, Vaniotis**
 - (b) Subcommittee will meet on 6/28 to recommend critical criteria changes.
 - v) Bradshaw requested more State Evaluators be added to the list
- f) Bradshaw and White ask where we were going with law change.
 - i) White stated Exam and Education Committees must prioritize for this process
 - ii) LeBrun noted need for deadline
 - (1) Vision would be Fall of ’07, but without further detail it is difficult to set a deadline.
 - iii) Education committee has and will prioritize accreditation.
 - iv) Exam will look at process
 - v) White noted the need for a project tracking form.

Meeting adjourned 1200